

slightest bearing on any public decision at the local level, the State level, the Federal level, the county level; anything imaginable would be swept under these mindless restrictions.

It is the most dangerous Orwellian, McCarthyite proposal we have seen in a long time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### UNITED STATES ASSISTING FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING IN THE PACIFIC?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 1, 1995, France detonated a second nuclear bomb in the South Pacific, thumbing its nose at over 150 nations that have called for France to stop its reckless and irresponsible behavior.

I find it deplorable that France, which exploded a 110 kiloton blast, seven times more destructive than the bomb that devastated Hiroshima, is again showing the world that, in the name of national interest, it is more than willing to reopen the global arms race while encouraging nuclear proliferation.

Mr. Speaker, I also find it deplorable that while the United States has gone on record as opposing France's resumption of nuclear testing and called for its end, our Government may in fact be in complicity with French President Chirac's decision to explode eight more nuclear bombs in the South Pacific.

On this subject, I would recommend to our colleagues and the public an excellent article in the New York Times, September 30, 1995, by Daniel Plesch and Simon Whitby of the British-American Security Information Council.

Mr. Plesch and Whitby note the near universal condemnation of France's resurrection of the nuclear nightmare in the South Pacific, and that despite the outcry, the United States continues to support the tests by allowing France to fly its DC-8 supply planes across the United States on their way to the Pacific. According to the State Department, these planes, which are likely carrying nuclear material, are permitted to stop over on the west coast.

They further state that, "the Clinton administration should prohibit these overflights. This ban might not stop the nuclear tests, but it would slow France's ability to supply and thus operate its Mururoa test site.

Mr. Speaker, this Mururoa atoll where France has exploded nuclear

bombs for the past 30 years, France has now exploded over 168 nuclear bombs on this atoll. This atoll now has probably 10 Chernobyls contained on this Pacific atoll, which is a volcanic formation. If that atoll ever leaks out, I do not know what is going to happen to the 200,000 Polynesian Tahitians living on these islands, let alone the 28 million people who live in the Pacific.

What arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that France has done this to the people of the Pacific region and might even be to the Americans living in the State of Hawaii on the Pacific coast States.

Mr. Speaker, I find it atrocious and the height of hypocrisy if this and other reports in the press are true that our Nation is acting in complicity with France's testing in the Pacific. Permitting French overflights of the United States with aircraft carrying nuclear materials or bomb components bound for France's South Pacific test site clearly undercuts the administration's policy against French testing.

Mr. Speaker—whether the administration is placing the American public at risk with these French nuclear overflights or is covertly supporting France's nuclear testing in the Pacific, I think they owe Members in Congress some answers regarding the extent and detail of U.S. nuclear collaboration with the Government of France. This matter is rife with hypocrisy and should not be kept hidden and secret from the American people.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, if these French planes are carrying plutonium or other fissile materials, these overflights would be in clear violation of U.S. law without certification clearances from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Energy. For the State Department to merely declare that they don't know what's on board these flights is a travesty.

Mr. Speaker, if the Clinton administration is sincere about nuclear disarmament and opposition to French nuclear testing, it should immediately suspend all nuclear cooperation with France until it acts responsibly by stopping their tests in the Pacific.

The article follows:

[The New York Times, Sept. 30, 1995]

FRANCE'S BOMB, OUR PROBLEM

(By Daniel Plesch and Simon Whitby)

WASHINGTON.—The world has looked on in outrage as France has brought the nuclear nightmare back to the South Pacific. To date, 150 countries have criticized the underground weapons tests at the Mururoa Atoll in French Polynesia that resumed early this month after three years and that are to continue into 1996. Despite the outcry, the United States continues to support the tests by allowing France to fly its DC-8 supply planes across the United States on their way to the Pacific. According to the State Department, these planes, which are likely carrying nuclear material, are permitted to stop over on the West Coast.

The Clinton Administration should prohibit these overflights. This ban might not stop the nuclear tests, but it would slow France's ability to supply and thus operate its Mururoa test site.

State Department officials acknowledge that the French are ferrying military equipment, but they will neither confirm nor deny reports that the planes are carrying nuclear materials.

After the international opposition to the Pacific tests spread last summer, France reversed its long-held position at talks in Geneva on a comprehensive treaty that would ban all nuclear weapons tests. It no longer argues for a loophole that would allow the testing of nuclear weapons with under 500 tons of explosive power.

But France also said it will not agree to a full test ban until after its tests in the Pacific are completed in 1996.

The overflights are only one example of the complex relationship between France and the United States on nuclear weapons. Relations have always been highly secret and have never been subject to Congressional scrutiny.

During World War II, France supplied the Manhattan Project—the development of the atomic bomb—with heavy water that it had taken out of the country ahead of the advancing Nazis.

In the early 1970's, France helped the United States get around provisions of the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963. President John F. Kennedy had committed to a ban on above-ground nuclear tests. France, however, had not made such a pledge and continued to explode bombs above Mururoa until 1974. American planes were allowed to fly near the blasts to collect data.

In return for this privilege and for France's practical support for NATO, even though it had withdrawn from the alliance's military command, the United States has given France considerable help in building its nuclear forces.

Experts who are familiar with the arrangement say that this has included assistance for France's work on the neutron bomb, nuclear-warhead components, missile guidance systems and stealth technology for cruise missiles. Today, the United States is reported to be helping France with computer tests of its nuclear stockpile.

President Jacques Chirac has said that these tests are needed to determine if the weapons will work properly. But French officials have acknowledged that the main reason is to gather the data needed to develop new warheads. But they do not acknowledge that the United States is helping them.

France maintains that it has never relied on foreign support to build its nuclear weapons and that it never will. The secrecy around the program has helped France preserve its image as an independent nuclear state—a keystone of its foreign policy.

To undermine this not-so-grand illusion and to stress its opposition to French tests in the Pacific, Congress should insist that the Clinton Administration disclose the details of the American nuclear collaboration with France.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader's hour may precede the minority leader's hour in special orders today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### THE ADVANTAGES OF NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May